



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

acter in "its capacity for growth or decay," "the highest and at the same time the most tragic" of all its qualities (p. 150).

Prof. Vaughan gives, very rightly, much space to the Greek drama. He is most in sympathy with Æschylus, whom he calls the greatest master of dramatic *situation* that ever lived, an illuminating phrase. But one is inclined to quarrel with him for his treatment of Euripides. He only understands that most human poet's effort "to bring the drama nearer to the actual interests and emotions of his own day" (p. 64); he says little or nothing of his passionate religious preoccupation, nothing of his passionate reaction against the cruel mythology that had come to him from the past. But this is surely the keynote of play after play, and if we do not catch it we are lost. In different ways Prof. Murray and Dr. Verrall have both called attention to this all-important feature. To miss it in Euripides is to miss the point of many of his most effective situations; and leads almost inevitably to the old injustice of saying that "the dominant note in his dramas is the love of effect: that, so long as an effect was obtained, he was comparatively indifferent as to the means by which it was secured," etc. (p. 81).

In connection with the whole question of character, Prof. Vaughan has some excellent remarks on "keenness and soundness of moral judgment" as "among the qualities that are indispensable to a great dramatist" (p. 57). This recalls Swinburne's admirable passage about Shakespeare's "implacable and impeccable righteousness of insight." And it suggests to a reviewer that the real and fatal weakness of Calderon (whom Prof. Vaughan discusses at considerable length) lies in his perverted notions of "honor" and "religion." It may be presumptuous in one who has no knowledge of Spanish to express an opinion here, but this is certainly the impression left by the translations; and Prof. Vaughan's eloquent advocacy does nothing to dissipate it: perhaps he did not intend that it should.

London.

F. MELIAN STAWELL.

MEMORIALS OF THOMAS DAVIDSON. Collected and edited by William Knight. London: Fisher Unwin, 1907. Pp. x, 241.

The reader who does not mind taking some trouble to make the acquaintance of a remarkable man will find this an interesting book. But he must take some trouble, for it is not a

biography, but a slovenly compilation; a jumble of reminiscences by various hands (among them a chapter by Professor William James), thrown together on no plan and interspersed with fragments of letters and summaries of several of Davidson's writings. As an instance of the lack of discretion with which the work has been done the first appendix may be mentioned. This consists of the prospectus of a lecture course on the origins of modern thought, followed by a list, which occupies nearly five pages, of books recommended for reading. It would have been more amusing, to say the least of it, to have printed instead an act of "Themistocles," the five-act tragedy which Davidson left in MS. The book abounds in misprints and has no index.

Thomas Davidson was born in 1840 of Scottish parents in humble circumstances. He graduated at Aberdeen in 1860 and began life as session clerk and schoolmaster. Too restless for these occupations, he went to America in 1863. He appears to have taught at Toronto and St. Louis and to have held for a short time an examinership at Harvard. But the trammels of academic life were always distasteful to him, and already in the early '80's we find him alternating between London and Italy. In Italy he plunged into the study of Rosmini (he occupied a villa at Domodossola, near the Rosminian monastery) and held friendly communication with Pope and Cardinals at Rome; and in London he founded the "Fellowship of the New Life," a body from which the Fabian Society sprang by schism in 1884. It was in that year that he founded the New York branch of the fellowship, of which his College of the Bread-winners (a system of lectures to East Side Russian Jews) was a later offshoot. In 1888 he began at the New England town of Farmington the "Summer School of the Culture Sciences," which in 1891 was absorbed in his summer school at Glenmore in the Adirondacks. Davidson died September 14, 1900. These are the chief landmarks in a life which included periods spent in most of the European capitals as well as visits to Greece, Constantinople and Egypt.

The analogy which his friends constantly use to describe him is that of some wandering scholar of the Renaissance—a romantic, heroic figure, immensely learned, burning with spiritual zeal and brought by his migrations in the service of the Muses into contact with eminent people all over the world. The range

of Davidson's learning was certainly remarkable. Besides being a classical scholar, at home in archæology and widely read in philosophy and its history, he was proficient in most European languages and acquired some Arabic. He actually published few books. Speech was more natural to him than writing, and articles and lectures than systematic works; but, short though it is, the list gives some idea of his versatility. It includes books on education (Greek Education and Rousseau), a treatise on the Parthenon frieze, Prolegomena to Tennyson's "In Memoriam," translations of Rosmini and of Scartazzini's "Handbook" to Dante, and a book about Rosmini's philosophy. In his later years he specialized on medieval thought, and had projected a large work on that subject which he did not live to complete. The metaphysical, almost mystical, enthusiasm which pervaded all his acquisitions of knowledge completes the comparison with some such Renaissance figure as Giordano Bruno. Yet in other ways he was essentially modern. For one thing, it is significant that he took no interest in science; none but "culture subjects" attracted him, an attitude of mind inconceivable in the Renaissance. Again, in spite of his dislike for university routine, his work, as was inevitable in the nineteenth century, was done among what may be called the semi-academic section of the middle classes. Three centuries earlier he might have found his disciples among noblemen and princes; but, as it is, the "later nineteenth century ethical movement," of which Davidson was a pioneer, is composed of people in fairly comfortable circumstances, drawn from the middle class and the better-off section of hand workers, who attend lectures and usually have some kind of connection with the life of universities. Such were the students at his summer school, where the instruction appears to have been of the type now given at university extension summer meetings; and to this class, too, belonged the group of young men whom he inspired in the early '80's to form the Fellowship of the New Life in London. The period (as witness the "æsthetic" movement) bristled with similar groups, formal and informal, in which the principle of cohesion was the desire to raise society to a higher level, and it is only an accident that entitles this particular short-lived association to be remembered. Its formulæ, with their insistence, due to Davidson, on the necessity of perfecting individual lives and of a "metaphysical" basis for social regeneration,

have now at most but a personal interest as a revelation of their author's character; but they produced a result of some importance, inasmuch as the more practical members of the fellowship, growing out of harmony with the founder's individualism and finding little profit in his metaphysics, broke away and formed the Fabian Society. Though there is irony in this play of circumstances by which a stalwart individualist and contemner of modern economics thus became the cause of the Fabian policy of insinuating collectivist doctrine into English politics, the incident shows how much may be accomplished by a visionary, provided that he is in earnest about his ideals and has the power of exciting enthusiasm and affection in others.

S. WATERLOW.

Rye, England.

DECADENCE: HENRY SIDGWICK MEMORIAL LECTURE. By the Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour, M. P. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. Pp. 62.

Why do communities decay? Mr. Balfour suggests in this lecture that in cases like that of the Roman Empire the ordinary political causes assigned by historians do not account for all the facts, and that some obscure cause, analogous to senescence in physical organisms, is at work. This cause we can only call decadence without further explanation. It is impossible, however, to say whether decadence is more or less normal than progress; all we can be sure of is that some races (such as those of the East) are constitutionally incapable of advancing beyond a certain point. As for western civilization, Mr. Balfour thinks it likely that the modern alliance between science and industry has introduced a new social factor which is perhaps strong enough to counteract any tendency toward decadence that may exist.

Mr. Balfour makes for his discourse the apology that it is tentative and interrogative and does not pretend to be an adequate treatment of an interesting theme. It is indeed often desirable—on an occasion commemorative of Henry Sidgwick it would be peculiarly fitting—that one who has studied a subject should make known what he thinks about it even when his conclusions are provisional or incomplete. Mr. Balfour's apology has all the air of being the apology of an inquirer in this